UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,920	11/03/2003	James Stoupis	A149 1020.1	3866

7590 02/27/2006

WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE
P.O Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037

EXAMINER	
RAHMAN, FAHMIDA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2116	

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/699,920	STOUPIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fahmida Rahman	2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 November 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *10,19 and 20* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11-18 and 21-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/17/2004, 5/28/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-42 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/26/2005 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 2/17/2004 is not considered by the examiner, since Examiner fails to find the WO publications in the record.

Claim Objections

Claims 10, 19-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 10, the tool recites "protection philosophy preference" in line 2. However, claim 9 does not mandate that the tool comprise protection philosophy preference. The alternative can be protection curve. Examiner provides the prior art reference for the limitation "protection curve". Therefore, claim 10 has not been treated on the merits.

In claims 19 and 20, the tool recites "protection coordination engine" and "coordination simulation engine". However, claim 18 does not mandate that the

tool comprise "protection coordination engine" and "coordination simulation engine". The alternative can be "programmable input/output mapping engine". Examiner provides the prior art reference for the limitation "programmable input/output mapping engine". Therefore, claims 19 and 20 have not been treated on the merits.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

2. "550560" in [0031] of page 3 should be changed to "550, 560"

"protec tion" should be changed to "protection"..

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 11, 13, 14, 16-18, 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0046246), in view of Thelander et al (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0009705).

For claim 1, Wright et al teach the following limitations:

An automatic configuration tool (Fig 1) **for use with power protection and restoration devices** (105), **comprising:**

a processor (200);

a memory for storing a plurality of databases (205);

a graphical user interface ([0027] of page 2 mentions that the design of IED includes communication capabilities such as e-mail, instant messaging, chat, newsgroup capabilities. Thus, user can communicate with the power protection and restoration device through e-mail or other graphical user interface);

and an automatic configuration application (400) **operating on the processor to provide to a user on the graphical user interface to enable the user to select a plurality of options** ([0014] of page 2 mentions that IED may transmit e-mail to user including data relating to power systems. [0018] of page 2 mentions that the user may perform periodic setting adjustments, profile changes in an automatic and secure manner. Thus, the system allows user to view the information about power system and choose a setting adjustment/updates**) that are processed to determine and export a plurality of configuration settings for a specific power protection and restoration device** (Fig 3 shows that the settings are transported to IED. In addition, lines 14-17 of page 1 mention that e-mail includes settings, configuration, commands, requests for information. Thus,

the user can request for information and select appropriate settings based on the information).

Although Wright et al teach that the e-mail transmitted from and to IED may include non-text files, such as graphics and sound files, Wright et al do not teach that the GUI has plurality of menus to enable the user to select a plurality of options.

Thelander et al teach a system where a plurality of menus is displayed to a user through GUI to select appropriate settings (Fig 4).

It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wright et al and Thelander et al. One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate a GUI to provide a plurality of menus to the user in the system of Wright et al to select a plurality of options, since GUI is a well known approach in the art to provide flexibility of choosing desirable settings.

For claim 2, the IED of Wright et al is fed with a settings file, configuration. Thus, the system has plurality of settings module, settings file and a calculation engine to process the command received from the user as shown in 420.

For claim 11, [0033] of page 3 of Wright et al mentions that the various communications protocol may be implemented by the IED.

For claim 13, [0014] of page 2 of Wright et al mentions about power quality data.

For claim 14, note [0042] of page 4 of Wright et al, which mentions that several operating parameters can be changed for the IED. Thus, a plurality of programmable functions can be configured by the user.

For claim 16, [0014] of page 2 of Wright et al mentions about oscillographic data.

For claim 17, [0016] of page 2 of Wright et al mentions that simulators can be used to reproduce the problem. Thus, fault and disturbance data is captured.

For claims 18 and 21, lines 5-7 of [0042] of page 4 of Wright et al, which mention that the command causes IED to perform a certain function at a certain time. Thus, there is an input/output mapping engine for mapping logic that enables the user to perform plurality of functions at plurality of times.

For claim 22, [0033] of page 3 of Wright et al mentions that the database for controlling, monitoring and protecting equipments exist in the system. Thus, the databases include a protection philosophy database.

For claim 23, [0042] of page 4 of Wright et al mentions that the configuration file causes IED to change several operating parameters. Thus, the power protection and restoration file has the plurality of determined settings.

For claims 24 and 25, [0037] of page 4 of Wright et al mentions that the e-mail can be HTML formatted or XML formatted. Thus, the settings file can be XML or web based.

4. Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0046246), in view of Thelander et al (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0009705), as applied to claim 2 above, further in view of ordinary skill in the art.

For claim 3, the combination of Wright et al and Thelander et al does not disclose a module to select an application type for a power system installation.

However, it is required to select the application type for the power system installation, since different types of systems require different settings. Thus, an ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the type of power system installation to configure the system properly.

For claims 4-6, user needs to select for tansmission or distribution system, new or retrofit for proper operation of the system. Transmission and distribution

systems are well known in the art and an ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Wright et al in power transmission and distribution application.

5. Claims 7, 8, 12, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0046246), in view of Thelander et al (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0009705), further in view of Sezi et al.

For claims 7 and 8, the combination of Wright et al and Thelander et al does not disclose the tripping preferences.

Sezi et al disclose the tripping preferences (Fig 14).

It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Wright et al, Thelander et al and Sezi et al. One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include tripping preferences for 3-phase and 1-phase circuit, since that is a way to control power system operation.

For claim 12, Sezi et al teaches load profile information and metering values (lines 1-2 of page 949).

For claim 15, note page 948 of Sezi et al for trip and breaker control.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0046246), in view of Thelander et al (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0009705), further in view of Azbe et al.

For claim 9, the combination of Wright et al and Thelander et al does not mention about over current curve. Azbe et al teach the over current protection curve (Fig 7).

It would have been obvious for an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wright et al, Thelander et al and Azbe et al. One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to set the protection curve, since that is a part of configuration of IED.

7. Claims 26-29, 31, 32, 34-36, 38-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0046246)

For claim 26, Wright et al teach the following limitations:

A method for automatically configuring a power protection and restoration device (105) comprising the steps of:

generating a plurality of databases to store protection, control and monitoring information for power protection and restoration devices (205 is storing the plurality of databases for protection, controlling and monitoring application for power protection and restoration devices. Thus, the system generates plurality of databases to store varieties of data);

selecting a plurality of presented options interactively using a graphical user interface ([0027] of page 2 mentions that the design of IED includes communication capabilities such as e-mail, instant messaging, chat, newsgroup capabilities. Thus, user can communicate with the power protection and restoration device through e-mail or other graphical user interface. In addition, [0014] of page 2 mention the types of data IED can receive to and from the user via e-mail and [0018] mentions the adjustment of settings by the user. Thus, user can select the options presented to him via e-mail);

processing the selected plurality of options using a calculation engine to determine a plurality of protection, control and monitoring settings (There must be a calculation engine to process the entered options by the user);

creating a protection, control and monitoring settings output file (310 shows the downloading of data. Thus, there is settings output file);

and automatically downloading the protection, control and monitoring settings output file to an intelligent electronic device for the power protection and restoration device ([0018] of page 2)..

For claim 27, 225 is the configuration database.

For claim 28, configuration settings can be mailed to user. Thus, plurality of options include configuration settings.

For claim 29, [0014] of page 2 mentions oscillographic data.

For claim 31, IEDs are protection device.. Thus, the system allows user to set a protection philosophy.

For claim 32, [0033] of page 3 of Wright et al mentions that the various communications protocol may be implemented by the IED.

For claim 34, [0014] of page 2 of Wright et al mentions about power quality data.

For claim 35, note [0042] of page 4 of Wright et al, which mentions that several operating parameters can be changed for the IED. Thus, a plurality of programmable functions can be configured by the user.

For claim 36, [0014] of page 2 of Wright et al mentions about oscillographic data.

For claim 38, [0014] of page 2 mentions the SOE data.

For claim 39, note [0042] of page 4 of Wright et al, which mentions that several operating parameters can be changed for the IED. Thus, a plurality of programmable functions can be configured by the user.

Claims 40-42 implement the medium necessary to store the methods performed in claim 26, 28 and 29 respectively. The medium is required to perform the execution of the method. Thus, the cited prior art teaches the medium necessary in claims 40-42.

8. Claims 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0046246), further in view of Sezi et al.

For claim 30, Wright et al do not disclose the tripping preferences.

Sezi et al disclose the tripping preferences (Fig 14).

It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Wright et al, and Sezi et al. One ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to include tripping preferences, since that is a way to control power system operation.

For claim 33, Sezi et al teaches load profile information and metering values (lines 1-2 of page 949).

9. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0046246), further in view of Azbe et al.

For claim 37, Wright et al do not mention about over current curve. Azbe et al teach the over current protection curve (Fig 7).

It would have been obvious for an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wright et al, and Azbe et al. One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to set the protection curve, since that is a part of configuration of IED.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fahmida Rahman whose telephone number is 571-272-8159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on 571-272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Fahmida Rahman
Examiner
Art Unit 2116

LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100